



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Regulating the local availability of tobacco retailing in Madrid, Spain: a GIS study to evaluate compliance.

Citation for published version:

Valiente, R, Sureda, X, Bilal, U, Navas-Acien, A, Pearce, J, Franco, M & Escobar, F 2018, 'Regulating the local availability of tobacco retailing in Madrid, Spain: a GIS study to evaluate compliance.', *Tobacco Control*. <<https://tobaccocontrol.bmj.com/content/early/2018/07/10/tobaccocontrol-2018-054269.info>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Tobacco Control

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Tobacco Control

Regulating the local availability of tobacco retailing in Madrid, Spain: a GIS study to evaluate compliance

Journal:	<i>Tobacco Control</i>
Manuscript ID	tobaccocontrol-2018-054269.R2
Article Type:	Research paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Valiente, Roberto; University of Alcalá, Department of Geology, Geography and Environmental Sciences Sureda, Xisca; Universidad de Alcala de Henares, Bilal, Usama; Drexel Dornsife School of Public Health, Urban Health Collaborative Navas-Acien, Ana; Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, Department of Environmental Health Sciences Pearce, Jamie; University of Edinburgh, School of Geosciences Franco, Manuel; Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, Facultad de Medicina Escobar, Francisco; Universidad de Alcala de Henares Facultad de Filosofia y Letras, Department of Geology, Geography and Environmental Sciences
Keywords:	Environment, Socioeconomic status, Disparities

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Regulating the local availability of tobacco retailing in Madrid, Spain: a GIS study to evaluate compliance

Roberto Valiente (roberto.valiente@uah.es)^{1,2}; Xisca Sureda (francisca.sureda@uah.es)^{1*}; Usama Bilal (ubilal@drexel.edu)^{1,3}; Ana Navas-Acién (an2737@cumc.columbia.edu)⁴; Jamie Pearce (jamie.pearce@ed.ac.uk)⁵; Manuel Franco (manuel.franco@uah.es)^{1,6}, and Francisco Escobar (francisco.escobar@uah.es)^{1,2*}.

Authors' affiliations:

- 1 Social and Cardiovascular Epidemiology Research Group, School of Medicine, University of Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, Spain.
- 2 Department of Geology, Geography and Environmental Sciences, University of Alcalá, Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, Spain.
- 3 Urban Health Collaborative, Drexel Dornsife School of Public Health, Philadelphia, PA, USA
- 4 Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, United States.
- 5 Centre for Research on Environment, Society and Health, School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- 6 Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, United States.

*Both authors contributed equally to this manuscript.

Correspondence to: Xisca Sureda Llull, BPharm (francisca.sureda@uah.es), MPH, PhD. Social and Cardiovascular Epidemiology Research Group, School of Medicine, University of Alcalá. Campus Universitario - Ctra. de Madrid-Barcelona, Km. 33,600. Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, 28871, Spain.
Email: francisca.sureda@uah.es - Telf: +34 918 222 351

24 **Word count:** 3261/3500

25 **KEYWORDS**

26 Tobacco availability, Tobacco stores distribution, tobacco retail regulations, proximity analysis,
27 schools.

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Background: In Spain, tobacco sales are limited to tobacco-exclusive stores and associated vending
30 machines. A minimum of 150 metres between stores is required, unless they exceed a legal sales
31 threshold. Minimum distances to schools are recommended, but not defined. We evaluated
32 compliance with these regulations in Madrid, Spain.

33 Methods: Information about tobacco-exclusive stores and their sales volume was obtained for 2014.
34 We used Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to identify stores closer than 150 metres between
35 them and examine whether they exceeded the sales threshold. We estimated distances between
36 stores and schools, considering different distance intervals (<150m, 150-300m, >300m) and
37 calculations (crow flies and street network). We assessed the association of area-level demographic
38 and socioeconomic characteristics with the distribution of tobacco stores.

39 Results: 5.3% (34/638) of tobacco stores were within 150m of each other. Among those, 76%
40 (26/34) did not meet the regulation sales threshold. These stores were in areas with lower proportion
41 of young population (<15 years) and higher proportion of people with university-level education.
42 75% (476/638) of stores were situated closer than 300m to schools. No differences were identified
43 in sociodemographic and economic characteristics by the store distance to schools.

44 Conclusion: Most tobacco stores are compliant with the regulations in Spain. However, these
45 regulations are insufficient to reduce tobacco availability. More restrictive regulations are needed to
46 limit the geographic distribution of tobacco retailers, and health criteria should also be considered in

the current legislation. The evaluation of the Spanish regulatory model may provide useful insights for other jurisdictions looking to decrease the tobacco retail availability.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, in a number of countries, there has been a rapid increase in the range of measures adopted to combat the global tobacco epidemic. MPOWER measures established by the World Health Organization have been implemented across the world including smoke-free environments, advertising bans, health warnings, or the increase of tobacco taxes.[1,2] The availability of tobacco stores, however, remains ubiquitous in most countries. Regulating the supply and availability of tobacco products provides an important opportunity for achieving the tobacco endgame.[3,4]

Growing international evidence shows that local density of tobacco retailers is associated with greater risk of smoking[5] and tobacco initiation,[6] and with lower cessation rates among adults[7,8] and adolescents.[9–11] A greater density of tobacco retailing minimizes the time and resources needed to obtain cigarettes and contributes to tobacco normalization.[7–12] Emerging consensus indicates that tobacco stores tend to be disproportionately located in areas with high levels of social deprivation and/or greater proportion of vulnerable populations.[13–17]

Tobacco retail reduction strategies vary considerably among countries. It is therefore important to evaluate the efficacy of existing policies that restrict the distribution of tobacco stores.[3,4] The tobacco retail environment in Spain is distinctive since the sale of tobacco products is restricted to tobacco-exclusive stores (hereinafter, we refer to them as “tobacco stores”) and their associated vending machines.[18,19] Vending machines are supplied by one of their three closest tobacco stores, and their location is permitted in bars, restaurants, pubs, discos, hotels, petrol stations and newspaper stands.[20,21] The Tobacco Market Commission (TMC)[22] is a governmental organization tasked with monitoring the activity of tobacco stores and vending machines and their spatial distribution to ensure the “free competition” of the tobacco retail environment in Spain.[23]

Based on economic criteria, the TMC regulates the opening of new tobacco stores. A store is conceded through an auction procedure, in which it is awarded to the highest bid.[23] The location of the stores is pre-determined by population service and business-profitability criteria, based on the distances and the volume of sales of the neighbouring tobacco stores. Since 1999, the geographical concentration of stores is restricted by demanding a minimum distance of 150m between premises. Exceptions can be made in areas with a high demand for tobacco, provided that the location of a new premise will not disrupt the activity of the existing stores. In any case, a new store cannot be located closer than 150m to others if the aggregate tobacco sales volumes of the existing stores are lower than three times the average of the tobacco sales volume in the city in the previous year.[20,21] In addition, the Spanish tobacco regulation also recommends that the TMC takes distance to schools as a guiding factor but does not provide clear enforcing guidelines and no minimum distance has been specified between tobacco stores and schools.

The density of tobacco stores in Spain is lower compared to many other jurisdictions. For example, a recent study of 97 counties in the United States determined that the average density was 1.3 stores per 1000 residents,[24] while in Madrid this figure is 0.2 (vending machines not included). However, the smoking prevalence among adults (population older than 15 years) in Spain in 2015 was 29.1%, which is substantially higher than other countries (e.g. 19.2% in the United Kingdom, 17.2% in the United States or 14.9% in Australia).[25]

Given this regulatory context, we examine compliance with tobacco regulations in the city of Madrid, Spain. We applied a Geographic Information System (GIS)-based approach to 1) analyse the proximity between tobacco stores and their associated sales volume, 2) assess distances from tobacco stores to schools, and 3) evaluate how neighbourhood sociodemographic and economic characteristics are associated with the distance between tobacco stores and their proximity to schools.

97 **2. METHODOLOGY**

98 **2.1. Study Area**

99 Our study area is the city of Madrid, Spain, with 3.2 million of inhabitants in 2017.[26] This study
100 is part of the Heart Healthy Hoods project, which studies how social and physical characteristics of
101 the urban environment, including the tobacco retailing, may affect residents’ cardiovascular health
102 (<https://hhhproject.eu>).[27–29]

104 **2.2. Databases**

105 Tobacco stores

106 Information on the addresses and sales volume of all tobacco stores in the city (n=639) in 2014 was
107 provided by the TMC. Data on the tobacco sales volume were reported by the tobacco wholesalers
108 since they must declare their sales monthly to the TMC.[20,21] These data were registered for four
109 different types of products: cigarettes and cigars (units) and rolling and pipe tobacco (grams). The
110 TMC did not provide data on the number and location of vending machines, and our analyses were
111 restricted to tobacco stores. However, data on sales volume in each tobacco store also include the
112 sales occurred in their associated vending machines.

114 Schools

115 Data on the addresses of all schools in Madrid were gathered and geocoded from the Open-data web
116 service of the Madrid City Council for the year 2017.[30] Historical complete data for 2014 were
117 not available for this database. We selected pre-school, elementary, high schools, and centres for
118 children with disabilities to our analysis, regardless of their public or private funding.

119

120 Sociodemographic and economic data

121 Information about local population profiles including age and educational attainment was obtained
122 at the census tract level (n=2415, with a mean population of 1311) from the 2014 Madrid Municipal
123 Registry (<http://www-2.munimadrid.es/CSE6/jsps/menuBancoDatos.jsp>).[31] Age was categorized
124 in five groups: <15, 15-24, 25-44, 45-64 and >65 years old. Educational level was considered in
125 three categories: low (elementary studies or below), medium (secondary or high school diploma)
126 and high (university education or above). Data on education were registered for the population older
127 than 25 years and they were considered as an approximation of socioeconomic status. Information
128 about ethnicity was not included since in Spain it is prohibited to collect, store or distribute data
129 related ethnicity.[32]

130 Data about the location of recreational facilities were downloaded from the Open-data web service
131 of the Madrid City Council for 2014.[30] Recreational facilities were defined as places for leisure
132 activities. This information was used as a proxy for recreational land use, in order to evaluate how
133 the distances between tobacco stores and their proximity to schools are associated with the density
134 of recreational facilities. In our analyses, we considered hospitality venues (bars, restaurants, cafés,
135 pubs and discos), tourist accommodation (hotels, hostels and guesthouses), and other recreational
136 and cultural centres such as theatres, cinemas, or museums.

137

138 Other spatial data

139 The street network for the whole study area updated to 2017 was downloaded from the Open Street
140 Maps database.[33] Only the pedestrian road segments with public access were considered in our
141 study. Information about the administrative boundaries and contextual data was downloaded from
142 the Spanish National Mapping Agency (IGN).[34]

2.3. Geographical analyses

Proximity analysis between tobacco stores

Of the 639 tobacco stores registered in the city, we excluded one from our analyses because sales volume data were not available, resulting in 638 stores with complete data (99.8%). We performed a proximity analysis between them using ArcGIS 10.1. software (ESRI Inc., Redlands, CA, USA). Since the Spanish legislation does not specify how the distance between tobacco stores should be measured, we decided to estimate distances through the pedestrian street network, which better represents population movement across space.[8] However, an analysis using crow flies distances (straight-line distances) was also performed for comparison.

Using GIS, we estimated the shortest paths between all stores in the city. We identified the routes shorter than 150m and the stores involved in each route (figure 1A). Then, we checked whether the sum of the sales volume of the stores within the route exceeded the legal sales threshold. The total tobacco sales volume for each store was the sum of units of cigarettes and cigars, and units of rolling tobacco and pipe. The legal sales threshold is three times the average of the whole tobacco sales in the city. Since the tobacco sales were provided in different units according to the type of product, we needed to standardise them. Based on previous literature, the sales volume of rolling and pipe tobacco were estimated in cigarettes. For this purpose, we defined a weight of 0.5 grams to approximate the amount of tobacco that each cigarette unit of rolling or pipe tobacco may include. Other weights, defined in 0.8 and 1 grams, were also tested to explore different results for robustness.[35]

Proximity analyses from tobacco stores to schools

1479 schools were identified and geocoded within the study area. We used the pedestrian street network to estimate distances from all tobacco stores to their respective nearest schools using ArcGIS 10.1 software. Again, crow flies distances between tobacco stores and schools were also estimated for comparison. We assessed those distances by classifying all tobacco stores into different intervals: stores at less than 150m of a school; between 150 and 300m; or more than 300m (figure 1B). These intervals were used in previous literature that studies the effect of the proximity of tobacco stores to school on smoking behaviours.[36]

Characteristics of the population and recreational facilities around tobacco stores

We approximated the population served by each tobacco store using GIS and then computed the local sociodemographic characteristics. Specifically, we assigned each census tract to its closest tobacco store. We defined the closest tobacco store as that one whose location is closest to the centroid of each census tract. All stores were linked to at least one census tract (figure 1C).

We also assigned each recreational facility to their nearest tobacco store using GIS (figure 1D).

<Figure 1 here>

2.4. Statistical analyses

A descriptive analysis was conducted to calculate median and minimum distances between tobacco stores and between tobacco stores and schools. We estimated the percentage of stores that were closer than 150m to another store and not exceeded the legal-sales threshold, as well as the proportion of tobacco stores located in each of the intervals considered to analyse their proximity to schools.

We estimated the number of residents, and their related sociodemographic characteristics, associated to each tobacco store by aggregating the population of the census tracts that were linked to the same store through the geographical analysis (section 2.3.3). The proportion of people classified in each age group and educational level around each tobacco store were estimated. We also assessed the density of recreational facilities per 1000 inhabitants around each store by dividing the number of recreational facilities and the total population associated to each store (expressed per 1000 residents) through the geographical analysis (section 2.3.3). We used Stata 12.0. software (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA) to conduct a double-sided Kruskal Wallis test with a significance level of 95% to assess disparities in the distribution of tobacco stores according to sociodemographic characteristics and density of recreational facilities.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Proximity between tobacco stores

The median street distance between the tobacco stores in Madrid was 283m (SD=382m), while the minimum distance was 29m. The total sales volume of tobacco products in Madrid in 2014 was 4,211.3 million cigarettes (considering 0.5 grams as the weight to approximate the number of cigarettes of rolling and pipe tobacco). The mean sales volume was 6.6 million cigarettes per store and, the established legal sales threshold was 19.8 million cigarettes.

A total of 5.3% (34/638) establishments were less than 150m from another tobacco store through the street network. 76.5% of these stores (26/34) had sales volume lower than the legal sales threshold which justify that proximity (figure 2). These figures were robust regardless the weights used to estimate the number of cigarettes of rolling and pipe tobacco. We considered these 26 stores were in over-provisioned areas, according to the Spanish legislation. Around 2% of the population of Madrid were living in that over-provisioned areas. We observed significant differences in the

distribution of tobacco stores by sociodemographic characteristics (table 1). Within the over-provisioned areas, we found a lower percentage of population younger than 15 years old (11.1% vs 13.7%, $p<0.001$), and a higher percentage of people with university studies (40.5% vs 31.7%, $p=0.014$, respectively), compared to the rest of stores. Although the median density of recreational facilities around tobacco stores seemed higher among the over-provisioned areas, the statistical analysis showed no significant difference between both groups of tobacco stores (3.8 vs 3.3, $p=0.213$).

<figure 2 here>

Table 1: Characteristics of the population and density of recreational facilities associated with tobacco stores according to tobacco retail regulation criteria.

Characteristics of the population associated with tobacco stores classified by proximity between them			
	Over-provisioned areas: tobacco stores closer than 150m and not exceeding the legal sales threshold (n=26)	Non-over-provisioned areas: tobacco stores further than 150m between them, or closer than 150m but exceeding the legal sales threshold (n=612)	p-value*
Total population served (estimated residents)	67,036 (2.1%) ¹	3,099,094 (97.9%) ¹	<0.001
Age (percent of total residents for each group of stores)			
- < 15 years	11.1%	13.7%	<0.001
- 15 – 24	8.3%	8.9%	0.187
- 25 – 44	33.7%	31.0%	0.077
- 45 – 64	26.8%	26.2%	0.099
- > 65 years	20.1%	20.2%	0.401
Educational level (percent of the residents older than 25 years for each group of stores)			
- Less than elementary and elementary	35.9%	43.3%	0.038
- Secondary	23.7%	25.0%	0.275
- University	40.5%	31.7%	0.014
Median density of recreational facilities per store (number recreational facilities per 1,000 inhabitants)	3.8 [0.3 - 58.7]	3.2 [0 - 79.4]	0.213

¹ Percentages estimated respect the total population of Madrid: 3,166,130 inhabitants (data from 2014).

* Kruskal Wallis test with a significance level of 95%.

The analyses using crow flies distances identified that 22.4% of tobacco stores (143/638) were located within a radius of 150m to another store. 76.2% of these stores (109/143) did not exceed the legal sales threshold. Around 10.4% of the total population of Madrid were living in these over-provisioned areas, and their sociodemographic characteristics were similar to the ones exposed in table 1.

3.2. Distance from tobacco stores to schools

The median street distance from tobacco stores to schools was 216m (SD=647m). The minimum distance identified was 19m. 27% of tobacco stores had at least one school closer than 150m, 48% between 150 and 300m, and 25% further than 300m through the street network (figure 3). Tobacco stores with at least one school closer than 150m covered 28% of the total population in Madrid; stores that had at least one school between 150 and 300m covered 47% of the population, and those with no school closer than 300m covered 25% of the population (p=0.33). Table 2 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the population and the density of recreational facilities associated with tobacco stores according to their proximity to their closest school. We observed no significant differences in terms of age, educational level and density of recreational facilities by proximity to the closest school.

<figure 3 here>

Table 2: Characteristics of the population and density of recreational facilities associated with tobacco stores according to their proximity to schools.

Characteristics of the population associated with tobacco stores classified by their distance to closest school				
	Less than 150m to a school (n=169 tobacco stores)	Closest school between 150 and 300m (n=307 tobacco stores)	No school closer than 300m (n=162 tobacco stores)	p-values*
Total population served (units)	891,584 (28.2%) ¹	1,497,001 (47.3%) ¹	777,545 (24.5%) ¹	0.326
Age (percent of total residents for each group of stores)				

- < 15 years	14.2%	13.6%	13.2%	0.634
- 15 – 24	8.9%	8.8%	9.1%	0.086
- 25 – 44	31.7%	31.1%	30.4%	0.691
- 45 – 64	25.6 %	26.1%	26.9%	0.548
- > 65 years	19.6 %	20.4%	20.4%	0.510
Educational level (percent of total residents older than 25 for each group of stores)				
- Less than elementary and elementary	44.1 %	43.2%	41.7%	0.273
- Secondary	24.5 %	25.3%	24.8%	0.379
- University	31.4 %	31.5%	33.5%	0.420
Density of recreational venues (Number recreational facilities per 1,000 inhabitants)	3.0 [0.2 – 58.7]	3.3 [0 – 79.4]	3.4 [0 – 47.6]	0.439

¹ Percentages estimated respect the total population of Madrid: 3,166,130 inhabitants (data from 2014).

* P-values estimated through a Kruskal Wallis test with a significance level of 95%.

The analyses using crow flies distance showed that 48% of tobacco stores were located within a radius of 150m to a school in Madrid. These stores covered 49.9% of the population. 44.8% of tobacco stores were located between 150 and 300m and 7.2% were located further than 300m. There were no significant differences between tobacco stores regarding sociodemographic characteristics of the population served by them.

4. DISCUSSION

This paper offers new insights into the tobacco retail regulation in Spain which restricts the sales of tobacco to tobacco-exclusive stores and their associated vending machines, demands minimum distances between retailers, and recommends distances to schools. Our analyses showed how tobacco retail regulations in Madrid are reasonably well enforced in terms of minimum distances between tobacco stores when street distances are considered; as only 5.3% of tobacco stores were situated less than 150m to another tobacco store. However, 76.5% of these tobacco stores were under the legal sales threshold and therefore were not compliant with the regulation. This level of compliance decreased when crow flies distances were considered, as opposed to using a street

1
2 263 network distance. Non-compliant stores were more likely to be situated in areas with a lower
3
4 264 proportion of population younger than 15 years and a higher proportion of people with university-
5
6 265 level education. We suggest these areas likely contain more commercial and recreational activities,
7
8 266 and pedestrian traffic.

10
11 267 Our results also provide little evidence that distances to schools are a material consideration in the
12
13 268 implementation of the regulation of tobacco store locations. 75% of tobacco stores in Madrid were
14
15 269 situated closer than a street distance of 300m to a given school. This proportion increased to 92.8%
16
17 270 when distances were measured as the crow flies. Contrary to the results obtained in other studies,
18
19 271 which associate the proximity between tobacco stores and schools with social deprivation[37] and
20
21 272 commercial and recreational land use[38], in Madrid we found that the distribution of the stores did
22
23 273 not show disparities in terms of the total number of population served, age, educational level or
24
25 274 density of recreational facilities when considering distances to schools.

27
28
29 275 The Spanish model may provide some keys for jurisdictions looking to reduce the availability of
30
31 276 tobacco stores, especially, in places that do not restrict their distribution (e.g. Scotland,[39], New
32
33 277 Zealand[40] or most of the United States). Our results suggest that current regulations are
34
35 278 reasonably well enforced, and the availability of tobacco stores in Madrid is lower than other
36
37 279 places, as we exposed in the introduction. However, our results also indicate the need to improve
38
39 280 the effectiveness of the tobacco retail regulations and pose some potential recommendations that
40
41 281 could be considered in other jurisdictions.

43
44 282 First, the tobacco retail regulation in Spain is driven only by business profitability criteria. Public
45
46 283 health mandates could be incorporated into the regulatory model to better reduce the availability of
47
48 284 tobacco products and achieve the public health goal of reducing tobacco use. Second, the mandated
49
50 285 minimum distances between stores in Spain are relatively short. More restrictive minimum
51
52 286 distances have been applied elsewhere to regulate the alcohol outlet distribution showing positive
53
54 287 effects to reduce alcohol consumption[41] (e.g. the city of Edmonton demands minimum distances
55
56
57
58
59
60

of 500m between liquor stores).[42] Moreover, more clarity should be achieved in specifying the methods to measure these distances (e.g. street distances or crow flies distances), as our results show that compliance with the regulation varies widely depending on the measurement method. In this sense, the street network distances are more conservative and may bias the results toward high compliance. Policies based on crow flies distances may be more effective for tobacco retail reduction goals, as our results showed.

Third, some exceptions exist in the current regulation that allow for the location of new tobacco stores within 150m to another store as long as they exceed a sales threshold in the previous year.[20,21] These exceptions may be unwarranted and do not consider the market fluctuations of the tobacco products in the long-term. This is especially important given that licenses to open a tobacco retailer are valid for 25 years in Spain. We consider that these exceptions should be removed or, at least, a more comprehensive market research based on the sales volume registered during a broader period should be required. These licenses should be also reviewed in shorter-time periods (e.g. annually instead of 25 years-periods) to ensure their compliance with the law.

Fourth, tobacco vending machines are still permitted and their location is not geographically restricted.[19] These vending machines substantially increase the availability of tobacco products. Further tobacco regulations in Spain should consider banning or restricting the tobacco vending machines, similarly to regulations in other countries, like France.[43]

Fifth and last, the current regulatory framework does not explicitly mandate a minimum distance between tobacco stores and schools. Our analyses revealed that enforcing minimum street distances of 150m to school would remove 28.2% of tobacco stores in Madrid (and up to 50% if distances were measured as the crow flies). Similar regulations have already been implemented in other places: India bans the tobacco sales within a buffer distance of 30m to schools;[44] and Santa Clara County, USA, established a minimum distance of 1000 feet (300m).[45] Future policy interventions

in Spain should consider explicitly limiting the number and location of tobacco stores near youth-serving facilities, including schools.

This study has some limitations. The data on the location of tobacco vending machines was not available, and thus could not be included in the analysis, leading to an underestimation of the real tobacco availability in Madrid. Future research should include vending machines in the analysis once this data is available. Moreover, data on tobacco stores was limited to 2014, with no data on the opening year of each store. We cannot rule out the possibility that stores that were not currently in compliance with the regulation were indeed compliant in previous years (at the time they got the license to open). Last, we do not yet have data on smoking prevalence by neighbourhood in Madrid, so our results cannot yet inform the association between tobacco retail environment and smoking prevalence. However, this study is part of the “Heart Healthy Hoods” project which is currently collecting data on smoking behaviours among a cohort of adult in Madrid. Future studies will explore the association of tobacco retail environment in Madrid with tobacco consumption reported by its residents and their cardiovascular health.

This paper explores a unique regulatory framework which may provide new insights for tobacco retailing policies. Our findings underline some strengths and weaknesses of this legislation and emphasize the importance of considering public health criteria into tobacco availability regulations.

WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS

- *What is already known on this subject?*
 - Density and proximity to tobacco stores have been already associated with greater risk of smoking, favouring tobacco initiation, and decreasing quitting success.
 - GIS may constitute a valuable tool to understand the spatial distribution and the effect of tobacco stores on the smoking behaviours.

- *What important gaps in knowledge exist on this topic?*

- More research is needed to assess the effectiveness of the current policies to recommend new guidelines for restricting the number and location of tobacco retailers in the environment. This constitutes a critical step in the progress towards tobacco endgame.

- *What this study adds?*

- This study provides the evaluation of a unique legislation framework regulating tobacco retail environment in Madrid, Spain.
- Our analysis identified some strengths and weaknesses within the tobacco retail regulation framework in Spain that may provide useful lessons for policymakers in other countries looking to reduce the density of tobacco retailers and their related disparities.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank to the Spanish Tobacco Market Commission for all the data provided. We also thank Dra. Luisa Borrell for her methodological contributions to this manuscript and to Andrea Pastor and Rocio Santuy for statistical support.

Contributors: RV, XS, and FE conceive the original idea. RV geocoded, prepared the databases, and analysed the data with the advice of FE and XS. FE supervised both GIS analyses and cartographic outputs. XS designed and supervised tobacco epidemiological methods and quantitative analytical procedures. All authors contributed substantially to the interpretation of the data and manuscript review and approved its final version. XS and MF are the guarantors.

Funding: This study has been supported by a pre-doctoral fellowship offered to trainee researchers from the University of Alcalá (RV). The Heart Healthy Hoods project was funded by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013/ERC Starting Grant HeartHealthyHoods Agreement no. 623 336893). This study is also funded by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Subdirección General de Evaluación y Fomento de la Investigación, Government of Spain (PI15/02146). The funding sources have not any involvement

in the study design; in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of this work;
or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Conflict of interests: none.

REFERENCES

1 World Health Organization. *WHO global report on trends in prevalence of tobacco smoking*
2015. Geneva (Switzerland): 2015.
doi:http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/156262/1/9789241564922_eng.pdf?ua=1

2 World Health Organization. *WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2017:*
Monitoring tobacco use and prevention policies. Geneva (Switzerland): 2017.
doi:http://www.who.int/tobacco/global_report/2017/en/

3 Cohen JE, Anglin L. Outlet density: A new frontier for tobacco control. *Addiction*
2009;**104**:2–3. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02389.x

4 Henriksen L. The retail environment for tobacco: a barometer of progress towards the
endgame. *Tob Control* 2015;**24**:e1–2. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051884

5 Pearce J, Hiscock R, Moon G, *et al*. The neighbourhood effects of geographical access to
tobacco retailers on individual smoking behaviour. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
2009;**63**:69–77. doi:10.1136/jech.2007.070656

6 Cantrell J, Pearson JL, Anesetti-Rothermel A, *et al*. Tobacco retail outlet density and young
adult tobacco initiation. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2016;**18**:130–7. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntv036

7 Cantrell J, Anesetti-Rothermel A, Pearson JL, *et al*. The impact of the Tobacco Retail Outlet
environment on adult cessation and differences by Neighborhood poverty. *Addiction*
2015;**110**:152–61. doi:10.1007/s12020-009-9266-z.A

- 1
2 383 8 Pulakka A, Halonen JI, Kawachi I, *et al.* Association Between Distance From Home to
3
4 384 Tobacco Outlet and Smoking Cessation and Relapse. *JAMA Intern Med* 2016;**176**:1512.
5
6 385 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.4535
7
- 8
9 386 9 Shortt NK, Tisch C, Pearce J, *et al.* The density of tobacco retailers in home and school
10
11 387 environments and relationship with adolescent smoking behaviours in Scotland. *Tob Control*
12
13 388 2016;**25**:75–82. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2013-051473
14
- 15
16 389 10 Mennis J, Mason M, Way T, *et al.* The role of tobacco outlet density in a smoking cessation
17
18 390 intervention for urban youth. *Health Place* 2016;**38**:39–47.
19
20 391 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2015.12.008
21
- 22
23 392 11 Schleicher NC, Johnson TO, Fortmann SP, *et al.* Tobacco outlet density near home and
24
25 393 school: Associations with smoking and norms among US teens. *Prev Med* 2016;**91**:287–93.
26
27 394 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.08.027
28
- 29
30 395 12 Loomis BR, Kim AE, Busey AH, *et al.* The density of tobacco retailers and its association
31
32 396 with attitudes toward smoking, exposure to point-of-sale tobacco advertising, cigarette
33
34 397 purchasing, and smoking among New York youth. *Prev Med* 2012;**55**:468–74.
35
36 398 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.08.014
37
- 38
39 399 13 Shortt N, Tisch C, Pearce J, *et al.* A cross-sectional analysis of the relationship between
40
41 400 tobacco and alcohol outlet density and neighbourhood deprivation. *BMC Public Health*
42
43 401 2015;**15**:1014. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2321-1
44
- 45
46 402 14 Siahpush M, Jones PR, Singh GK, *et al.* Association of availability of tobacco products with
47
48 403 socio-economic and racial/ethnic characteristics of neighbourhoods. *Public Health*
49
50 404 2010;**124**:525–9. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2010.04.010
51
- 52
53 405 15 Loomis BR, Kim AE, Goetz JL, *et al.* Density of tobacco retailers and its association with
54
55 406 sociodemographic characteristics of communities across New York. *Public Health*
56
57

- 2013;**127**:333–8. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2013.01.013
- 408 16 Schneider S, Gruber J. Neighbourhood deprivation and outlet density for tobacco, alcohol
409 and fast food: first hints of obesogenic and addictive environments in Germany. *Public*
410 *Health Nutr* 2013;**16**:1168–77. doi:10.1017/S1368980012003321
- 411 17 Hyland A, Travers MJ, Cummings KM, *et al.* Tobacco Outlet Density and Demographics in
412 Erie County, New York. *Am J Public Health* 2003;**93**:1075–6.
- 413 18 Parliament of Spain. Ley 28/2005, de 26 de diciembre, de medidas sanitarias frente al
414 tabaquismo y reguladora de la venta, el suministro, el consumo y la publicidad de los
415 productos del tabaco. Boletín Oficial del Estado. 2005;**309**:56372–433.
416 doi:10.1128/MCB.00493-06
- 417 19 Parliament of Spain. Ley 42/2010, de 30 de diciembre, por la que se modifica la Ley
418 28/2005, de 26 de diciembre, de medidas sanitarias frente al tabaquismo y reguladora de la
419 venta, el suministro, el consumo y la publicidad de los productos del tabaco. Boletín Oficial
420 del Estado. 2010;**318**:11370–421. doi:BOE-A-2012-5403
- 421 20 Parliament of Spain. Real Decreto 1199/1999, de 9 de julio, por el que se desarrolla la Ley
422 13/1998, de 4 de mayo, de Ordenación del Mercado de Tabacos y normativa tributariay
423 regula el estatuto concesional de la red de expendedurías de Tabaco y Timbre. Boletín
424 Oficial del Estado. 1999;**166**:1–33.
- 425 21 Parliament of Spain. Real Decreto 748/2014, de 5 de septiembre, por el que se modifica el
426 Real Decreto 1199/1999, de 9 de julio, por el que se desarrolla la Ley 13/1998, de 4 de mayo,
427 de Ordenación del Mercado de Tabacos y Normativa Tributaria, y se regula el estatuto
428 concesi. Boletín Oficial del Estado. 2014;**220**:11370–421. doi:BOE-A-2012-5403
- 429 22 Comisionado para el Mercado de Tabacos - Ministerio de Hacienda y Administraciones
430 Públicas. <http://www.cmtabacos.es/wwwcmt/paginas/ES/webInicio.tmpl> (accessed 6 Oct

- 2017).
- 432 23 Parliament of Spain. Ley 13 / 1998 , de 4 de mayo , de Ordenación del Mercado de Tabacos
433 y Normativa Tributaria. Boletín Oficial del Estado. 1998;**107**:1–16.
- 434 24 Lee JGL, Sun DL, Schleicher NM, *et al*. Inequalities in tobacco outlet density by race,
435 ethnicity and socioeconomic status, 2012, USA: Results from the ASPiRE Study. *J*
436 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2017;**71**:487–92. doi:10.1136/jech-2016-208475
- 437 25 World Health Organization. Global Health Observatory. WHO.
438 2015.<http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.sdg.3-a-viz?lang=en> (accessed 11 Apr 2018).
- 439 26 Instituto Nacional de Estadística (Spanish Statistical Office). <http://www.ine.es/> (accessed 1
440 Oct 2017).
- 441 27 Bilal U, Díez J, Alfayate S, *et al*. Population cardiovascular health and urban environments:
442 the Heart Healthy Hoods exploratory study in Madrid, Spain. *BMC Med Res Methodol*
443 2016;**16**:104. doi:10.1186/s12874-016-0213-4
- 444 28 Franco M, Gullón P, Carreño V. Studying city life, improving population health. *Int J*
445 *Epidemiol* 2015;**46**:14–21. doi:10.1093/ije/dyv207
- 446 29 Franco M, Bilal U, Diez-Roux A V. Preventing non-communicable diseases through
447 structural changes in urban environments. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2015;**69**:509–11.
448 doi:10.1136/jech-2014-203865
- 449 30 Portal de datos abiertos del Ayuntamiento de Madrid (Madrid City Council Open Data
450 Portal). <http://datos.madrid.es/portal/site/egob/> (accessed 1 Oct 2017).
- 451 31 Banco de Datos del Ayuntamiento de Madrid (Madrid City Statistical Database Website).
452 <http://www-2.munimadrid.es/CSE6/jsps/menuBancoDatos.jsp> (accessed 1 Oct 2017).
- 453 32 Parliament of Spain. Ley Orgánica 15/1999, de 13 de diciembre, de Protección de Datos de

1
2 454 Carácter Personal. Boletín Oficial del Estado. 1999;:43088–99.
3
4 455 33 Open Street Map. <https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=6/40.007/-2.488> (accessed 1 Oct
5
6 456 2017).
7
8
9 457 34 Centro de descargas del Instituto Geográfico Nacional (Spanish National Mapping Agency).
10
11 458 <http://centrodedescargas.cnig.es/CentroDescargas/index.jsp> (accessed 1 Oct 2017).
12
13
14 459 35 Fu M, Martínez-Sánchez JM, Clèries R, *et al.* Opposite trends in the consumption of
15
16 460 manufactured and roll-your-own cigarettes in Spain (1991-2020). *BMJ Open* 2014;**4**:6–11.
17
18 461 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006552
19
20
21 462 36 Myers AE, Hall MG, Isgett LF, *et al.* A comparison of three policy approaches for tobacco
22
23 463 retailer reduction. *Prev Med* 2015;**74**:67–73. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.01.025
24
25
26 464 37 Ribisl KM, D’Angelo H, Feld AL, *et al.* Disparities in tobacco marketing and product
27
28 465 availability at the point of sale: Results of a national study. *Prev Med* 2017;**105**:381–8.
29
30 466 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.04.010
31
32
33 467 38 Frick M, Castro MC. Tobacco retail clustering around schools in New York City: Examining
34
35 468 ‘place’ and ‘space’. *Health Place* 2013;**19**:15–24. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2012.09.011
36
37
38 469 39 Tobacco Control Branch. Public Health Division of the Scottish Government. Guidance on
39
40 470 the display and pricing of tobacco products and smoking related products in Scotland , for
41
42 471 tobacco retailers and Local Authority Trading Standards Officers. 2013;:1–19.
43
44
45 472 40 New Zealand Government. Ministry of Health. Smoke-free Environments Act 1990. *New*
46
47 473 *Zealand Gazette* 1990;**108**:1–77.
48
49
50 474 41 Ashe M, Jernigan D, Kline R, *et al.* Land Use Planning and the Control of Alcohol, Tobacco,
51
52 475 Firearms, and Fast Food Restaurants. *Am J Public Health* 2003;**93**:1404–8.
53
54 476 doi:10.2105/AJPH.93.9.1404
55
56
57
58
59
60


- 42 The City of Edmonton. Bylaw 17836 to amend Bylaw 12800, as amended, The Edmonton
Zoning Bylaw. Edmont City Counc Website.
2001;;13.https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/PDF/Bylaw-17836.PDF
(accessed 16 Apr 2018).
- 43 Parliament of France. Order n° 2016-623 of May 19, 2016, concerning transposition of
Directive 2014/40/UE on the manufacture, display and sale of tobacco products and related
products. Journal Officiel de la République française. 2016.
- 44 Ministry of Law and Justice of India. The Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products (Prohibition
of advertisement and regulation of trade and commerce, production, supply and distribution)
Act 2003. The Gazette of India. 2003;10.
<http://www.who.int/fctc/reporting/Annexthreeindia.pdf>
- 45 Ribisl KM, Luke DA, Bohannon DL, *et al.* Reducing Disparities in Tobacco Retailer Density
by Banning Tobacco Product Sales Near Schools. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2017;**19**:239–44.
doi:10.1093/ntr/ntw185

FIGURE LEYEND:


Figure 1: Illustration and summary of the geographical analyses relating tobacco stores, schools, population characteristics and recreational facilities in Madrid.

Figure 2: Tobacco stores by proximity between them and their volume of sales for the whole city of Madrid.


Figure 3: Tobacco stores as classified by of their distance to the closest school.



297x419mm (150 x 150 DPI)



210x296mm (250 x 250 DPI)



210x296mm (250 x 250 DPI)

REVIEWER(S)' COMMENTS TO AUTHOR

Note:

In black colour: reviewers' comments to author

In blue colour: response to reviewers.

Dear Dr. Sureda:

Manuscript ID tobaccocontrol-2018-054269.R1 entitled "Regulating the local availability of tobacco retailing in Madrid, Spain: a GIS study to evaluate compliance" which you submitted to Tobacco Control, has been reviewed. After considering your manuscript, we would be pleased to accept it for publication, providing you attend to the following minor changes:

Response: The authors appreciate the comments and observations made by the editors and the reviewers that have improved the manuscript. They were very relevant grammatical corrections. They also helped us to clarify some specific sentences and ideas.

1. Remove hyphen from sales-threshold and 150-metres throughout. Please be consistent about crow flies, crow flies' (the apostrophe does not seem necessary).

Response: Thank you for that comment. We removed all the hyphens and the apostrophes after flies in the manuscript.

2. At line 20: A minimum of 150 meters between stores is required, unless stores exceed a legal sales threshold. Minimum distances to schools are recommended but not defined.

3. Abstract line 36:...considering different distances (<150m, 150-300m, >300m) and calculations (crow flies, roadway network).

Response to points 2-3: Thank you for the comments, we have modified that sentences.

4. After line 36, all distances could be written as 150m. No hyphen is needed.

Response: Thank you very much for the comment. We have applied the pertinent changes in the manuscript.

5. Line 39: ...were within 150m of each other.
6. Line 44: To shorten, omit “The findings demonstrate that”
7. Line 56: insert “a” or “the” before tobacco endgame.

Response to points 5-7: Thank you very much for these comments and corrections. We have applied these changes in the manuscript.

8. Please eliminate the number outlining beyond two digits (e.g., keep 2.2 Databases but eliminate the number headings for each subset).

Response: Thank you. We removed the numbers in the third-level headings.

9. Line 170: please clarify whether stores that are 150 meters from a school are in the first category or the second. The abstract is clear on this but the methods section is not.

Response: Thank you, we have clarified this sentence.

10. Line 205: Can you report a SD for the mean?

Response: Thank you for pointing out this. It is a very useful data to evaluate our results. We included in the manuscript (line 199 and line 229 in the marked-copy version of the main document).

11. Line 208: 19.8 million cigarettes. Omit of...
12. Line 212: omit that

Response to points 11-12: Thank you very much for this observation. We removed the prepositions in that sentences.

13. Line 264: These stores? Which ones? Do you mean Non-compliant stores?

Response: Thank you very much for the comment. We clarified the sentence in the manuscript.

14. Line 266: We suggest these areas likely contain more commercial and recreational activities and pedestrian traffic.

15. Line 276: Omit “those”

16. Line 278: parts of, most of

17. Line 295: Third, some exceptions exist

Response to points 14-17: Thank you, we have applied these changes.

1
2
3
4 18. Line 301: Why a 5-year review? Why not annually?
5

6 Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have included in the manuscript (line 298
7 in the market copy version of the main document).
8
9

10 19. Line 311: ban, bans
11

12 Response: Thank you for that observation. We amended the grammatical mistake.
13
14

15 20. Line 312: Santa Clara County in California (USA)...1000 feet (300 m).
16

17 Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have modified this sentence.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60